

HU-EP/08/60, IFIC/08-63, SFB/CPP-08-102

# The epsilon regime with Wilson fermions

<sup>1</sup>Oliver Bär, <sup>2</sup>Silvia Necco and <sup>1</sup>Stefan Schaefer<sup>1</sup>*Institute of Physics, Humboldt University Berlin,  
Newtonstrasse 15, 12489 Berlin, Germany*<sup>2</sup>*Instituto de Física Corpuscular, CSIC-Universitat de València  
Apartado de Correos 22085, E-46071 Valencia, Spain*

## Abstract

We study the impact of explicit chiral symmetry breaking of Wilson fermions on mesonic correlators in the  $\epsilon$ -regime using Wilson chiral perturbation theory (WChPT). We generalize the  $\epsilon$ -expansion of continuum ChPT to nonzero lattice spacings for various quark mass regimes. It turns out that the corrections due to a nonzero lattice spacing are highly suppressed for typical quark masses of the order  $a\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2$ . The lattice spacing effects become more pronounced for smaller quark masses and lead to non-trivial corrections of the continuum ChPT results at next-to-leading order. We compute these corrections for the standard current and density correlation functions. A fit to lattice data shows that these corrections are small, as expected.

PACS numbers: 11.15.Ha, 12.39.Fe, 12.38.Gc

arXiv:0812.2403v1 [hep-lat] 12 Dec 2008

## I. INTRODUCTION

The  $\epsilon$ -regime of QCD [1, 2] offers various advantages for the numerical determination of the low-energy couplings (LECs) in chiral perturbation theory (ChPT), the low-energy effective theory of QCD. Only the leading order LECs, the pseudo scalar decay constant in the chiral limit  $F$  and the chiral condensate  $\Sigma$ , enter the predictions of ChPT through next-to-leading order (NLO) in the epsilon expansion. The Gasser-Leutwyler coefficients [3, 4] first appear at one order higher, thus making the  $\epsilon$ -regime attractive for precise determinations of  $F$  and  $\Sigma$ .<sup>1</sup> In addition, gauge field topology plays an important role in the  $\epsilon$ -regime [6]. ChPT makes predictions for correlation functions restricted to individual topological sectors, thus enlarging the number of observables that can be compared to numerical lattice QCD results.

The role of topology and spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking has led to the widespread conviction that overlap [7] or domain-wall fermions [8, 9, 10] are the preferred or even mandatory choice for lattice simulations in the  $\epsilon$ -regime. Consequently, a fairly large number of quenched simulations with these fermions in the  $\epsilon$ -regime can be found in the literature [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]. Even though the results were to a large extent promising, the main hurdle for progress in real QCD is the need for simulations with dynamical sea quarks, and these are extremely time-consuming.<sup>2</sup> So far only the JLQCD collaboration [21] has carried out a large scale dynamical simulation with overlap fermions in the  $\epsilon$ -regime, and the computer resources that went into this simulation are enormous.

In contrast, fairly inexpensive simulations with tree-level improved Wilson fermions have been reported recently [22]. Reweighting as described in Ref. [23] has been used to reach small enough quark masses in order to be in the  $\epsilon$ -regime. The size of the box was  $L \simeq 2.8\text{fm}$ , much larger than in all the simulations mentioned before. Quite surprisingly, the data for the axial vector and pseudo scalar correlation functions are very well described by the corresponding ChPT predictions, although chiral symmetry is explicitly broken for Wilson fermions.

A similar observation has been made before by the ETM collaboration [24, 25]. Their data<sup>3</sup>, obtained with a twisted mass term [27, 28], also suggests that the  $\epsilon$ -regime can be reached with Wilson fermions. One might argue that automatic  $O(a)$  improvement at maximal twist [29, 30, 31] may suppress chiral symmetry breaking effects. Still, the data obtained with Wilson fermions raises the question if and how the results can be interpreted in the presence of the explicit chiral symmetry breaking by the Wilson term.

In this paper we study this question with Wilson ChPT [32, 33], the low-energy effective theory for lattice QCD with Wilson fermions. And indeed, our analysis suggests a natural answer to the question raised above. It turns out that the lattice spacing corrections are in general highly suppressed and show up at higher order in the epsilon expansion. For

---

<sup>1</sup> For a recent review of the various estimates see [5].

<sup>2</sup> For a recent review see [20].

<sup>3</sup> A review of the ETM results can be found in Ref. [26].

example, for quark masses  $m \sim a\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2$  the deviations from the continuum results due to the  $\mathcal{O}(a)$  corrections enter first at next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO). This is in contrast to the expansion in the  $p$ -regime, where the corrections already appear at next-to-leading order. This suppression is completely analogous to the suppression of terms involving the Gasser-Leutwyler coefficients in continuum ChPT in the  $\epsilon$ -regime.

However, the power counting in WChPT can be different, depending on the relative size of the quark mass  $m$  and the lattice spacing  $a$ . For this reason we also consider a different power counting where  $m \sim a\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2$  is no longer appropriate. In this case the lattice spacing corrections enter already at NLO. Interestingly, these corrections are entirely caused by the  $\mathcal{O}(a^2)$  term in the chiral effective Lagrangian that also determines the phase diagram of the lattice theory [32]. The corrections linear in the lattice spacing, stemming from the effective Lagrangian and the effective operators, are still of higher order in the epsilon expansion. This is relevant in practice: The Wilson ChPT expressions contain only one more unknown LEC at this order, and the predictive power is not spoiled by a plethora of free fit parameters.

We also use our WChPT results derived here for an analysis of the data of Ref. [22]. The corrections due to the nonzero lattice spacing turn out to be very small, supporting our theoretical analysis that these corrections are in general highly suppressed. This is very encouraging for lattice simulations with Wilson fermions. The impact of explicit chiral symmetry breaking for  $\epsilon$ -regime simulations is much less severe than previously thought. This makes simulations with Wilson fermions a serious and efficient alternative to those with chiral fermions.

## II. WILSON CHIRAL PERTURBATION THEORY (WCHPT)

### A. Chiral Lagrangian

The chiral effective Lagrangian of WChPT is expanded in powers of (small) pion momenta  $p^2$ , quark masses  $m$  and the lattice spacing  $a$ . Based on the symmetries of the underlying Symanzik action [34, 35] the chiral Lagrangian including all terms of  $\mathcal{O}(p^4, p^2m, m^2, p^2a, ma)$  is given in Ref. [33]. The  $\mathcal{O}(a^2)$  contributions are constructed in Ref. [36] and, independently, in Ref. [37] for the two-flavor case.

In the following we will restrict ourselves to  $N_f = 2$  with degenerate quark mass  $m$ . The continuum part of the chiral Lagrangian is the well-known Gasser-Leutwyler Lagrangian [3, 38]. With our notations the leading part reads (in Euclidean space-time)

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = \frac{F^2}{4} \text{Tr} (\partial_\mu U \partial_\mu U^\dagger) - \frac{F^2 B}{2} m \text{Tr} (U + U^\dagger). \quad (1)$$

The field  $U$  containing the pion fields is defined as usual,

$$U(x) = \exp \left( \frac{2i}{F} \xi(x) \right), \quad \xi(x) = \xi^a(x) T^a. \quad (2)$$

The  $\text{SU}(2)$  generators are normalized such that  $\text{Tr}(T^a T^b) = \delta^{ab}/2$ , so  $T^a = \sigma^a/2$  in terms of the standard Pauli matrices  $\sigma^a$ . The coefficients  $B$  and  $F$  are the familiar leading order

(LO) low-energy coefficients.<sup>4</sup> Higher order terms are collected in the next-to-leading order Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_4$  [3], which we do not need in this work.

The terms involving the lattice spacing are as follows:<sup>5</sup>

$$\mathcal{L}_a = \hat{a}W_{45}\text{Tr}(\partial_\mu U \partial_\mu U^\dagger) \text{Tr}(U + U^\dagger) - \hat{a}\hat{m}W_{68}(\text{Tr}(U + U^\dagger))^2, \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{a^2} = \frac{F^2}{16}c_2a^2(\text{Tr}(U + U^\dagger))^2. \quad (4)$$

$W_{45}, W_{68}$  are LECs, similar to Gasser-Leutwyler coefficients in  $\mathcal{L}_4$ . The quark mass and lattice spacing enter through the combinations

$$\hat{m} = 2Bm, \quad \hat{a} = 2W_0a, \quad (5)$$

where  $W_0$  is another low-energy coefficient [33]. Its presence here is for dimensional reasons:  $W_0$  is of dimension three and  $\hat{a}$  therefore of dimension two. Hence,  $\hat{a}$  has the same dimension as the familiar combination  $Bm$ .

We have chosen to parametrize the  $O(a^2)$  contribution in terms of the LEC  $c_2$ . This coefficient plays a prominent role since its sign determines the phase diagram of the theory [32]. We briefly come back to this after we have discussed the power counting in WChPT in section II C.

Note that the mass parameter  $m$  in eq. (1) is the so-called *shifted mass* [32]. Besides the dominant additive mass renormalization proportional to  $1/a$  it also contains the leading correction of  $O(a)$ . Consequently, the term  $F^2\hat{a}\text{Tr}(U + U^\dagger)/4$  is not explicitly present in the chiral Lagrangian since it is absorbed in the shifted mass [33]. Of course, physical results expressed by observables do not depend on what mass is used for the parametrization of the chiral Lagrangian.

## B. Currents and densities

The expressions for the currents and densities in continuum ChPT are well known. For example, the LO expressions for the axial vector current and the pseudo scalar density read

$$A_{\mu,\text{ct}}^a = i\frac{F^2}{2}\text{Tr}(T^a(U^\dagger\partial_\mu U - U\partial_\mu U^\dagger)), \quad (6)$$

$$P_{\text{ct}}^a = i\frac{F^2B}{2}\text{Tr}(T^a(U - U^\dagger)). \quad (7)$$

In WChPT these expressions receive corrections proportional to the lattice spacing. The currents and densities in WChPT can be constructed by a standard spurion analysis, similarly to the construction of the chiral Lagrangian. One first writes down the most general current/density that is compatible with the symmetries using the chiral field  $U$ , its derivatives and the spurion fields. Then, in a second step, one imposes the appropriate Ward

<sup>4</sup> With our normalization the pion decay constant in the chiral limit is  $F \approx 93\text{MeV}$ .

<sup>5</sup> We essentially adopt the notation of Refs. [39] and [31].

identities valid in the theory. For the vector and axial vector current this has been done in [40]. Alternatively one can introduce source terms for the currents and densities and constructs the generating functional, as has been done in Ref. [39]. Carrying over the notation of this reference the axial vector current including the leading corrections of  $O(a)$  reads

$$A_{\mu, \text{WChPT}}^a = A_{\mu, \text{cont}}^a \left( 1 + \frac{4}{F^2} \hat{a} W_{45} \text{Tr} (U + U^\dagger) \right) + 2 \hat{a} W_{10} \partial_\mu \text{Tr} (T^a (U - U^\dagger)) . \quad (8)$$

This axial vector does not satisfy any specific renormalization condition. Imposing a particular renormalization condition leads to a finite renormalization. Explicitly, one introduces [40]

$$A_{\mu, \text{ren}}^a(x) = Z_A A_{\mu, \text{WChPT}}^a(x) \quad (9)$$

with a renormalization factor  $Z_A$ .<sup>6</sup> Now one can impose a renormalization condition and demands that it is satisfied by  $A_{\mu, \text{ren}}^a$ ; this determines  $Z_A$ . For instance, in Ref. [40] the massless chiral Ward identity has been imposed.

Quite generally,  $Z_A$  has the form (up to  $O(a)$ )

$$Z_A = 1 + \frac{16}{F^2} \hat{a} W_A \quad (10)$$

with an unknown coefficient  $W_A$ . This form reflects the fact that, by construction, the WChPT current reduces to the correct continuum current for  $a \rightarrow 0$ . Consequently,  $Z_A$  is equal to one in the continuum limit, and (10) is the leading generalization for  $a \neq 0$ . Hence, the general form of the renormalized current is, up to  $O(a)$ ,

$$A_{\mu, \text{WChPT}}^a = A_{\mu, \text{cont}}^a \left( 1 + \frac{4}{F^2} \hat{a} [W_{45} \text{Tr} (U + U^\dagger) + 4W_A] \right) + 2 \hat{a} W_{10} \partial_\mu \text{Tr} (T^a (U - U^\dagger)) . \quad (11)$$

For brevity we have dropped the subscript “ren” on the left hand side. Terms of  $O(am, a^2)$  will be present at higher order in the chiral expansion.

Analogously, we use the expression [39]

$$P_{\text{WChPT}}^a = P_{\text{Cont}}^a \left( 1 + \frac{4}{F^2} \hat{a} [W_{68} \text{Tr} (U^\dagger + U) + 4W_P] \right) \quad (12)$$

for the pseudo scalar density. The contribution involving the LEC  $W_P$  (not present in Ref. [39]) stems from a general renormalization factor  $Z_P = 1 + 16 \hat{a} W_P / F^2$ , which we also allow, even though the results derived in this paper will not depend on the details of the  $O(a)$  correction.

---

<sup>6</sup>  $Z_A$  is a renormalization factor in the effective theory and should not be confused with  $Z_A$  in the underlying lattice theory.

### C. Power counting in infinite volume

In WChPT there are two parameters that break chiral symmetry explicitly, the quark mass  $m$  and the lattice spacing  $a$ . The power counting is determined by the relative size of these two parameters.

The literature [39, 41] distinguishes two quark mass regimes with different power countings: (i) the GSM regime<sup>7</sup> where  $m \sim a\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2$  and (ii) the Aoki regime where  $m \sim a^2\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^3$ . A priori one does not know in which regime one actually has performed a simulation. For this to decide one has to compare with the predictions of WChPT and check which expressions fit the data better. However, recalling how lattice simulations are typically done one can easily imagine that one starts in the GSM regime and by lowering the quark mass at fixed lattice spacing one will eventually enter the Aoki regime.

Depending on the particular regime, the LO Lagrangian is different. Since  $m \sim a^2\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^3$  in the Aoki regime, also the  $\mathcal{L}_{a^2}$  part in (4) counts as LO [37]:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GSM regime :} \quad & \mathcal{L}_{\text{LO}} = \mathcal{L}_2, \\ \text{Aoki regime :} \quad & \mathcal{L}_{\text{LO}} = \mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_{a^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The effects due to a nonzero lattice spacing are much more pronounced in the Aoki regime. Non-trivial phase transitions become relevant [32] and additional chiral logarithms proportional to  $a^2$  appear at one loop [37, 42].

### D. The pion mass and the PCAC mass in infinite volume

It is useful to derive the pion mass and PCAC mass at LO. We start with the calculation of the pion mass. Expanding the LO chiral Lagrangian to quadratic order in the pion fields we obtain

$$\text{GSM regime :} \quad M_0^2 = 2Bm, \tag{13}$$

$$\text{Aoki regime :} \quad M_0^2 = 2Bm - 2c_2a^2. \tag{14}$$

The sign of  $c_2$  determines the phase diagram of the theory [32].<sup>8</sup> For  $c_2 > 0$  there exists a second-order phase transition separating the Aoki phase [43]. The charged pions are massless in this phase due to the spontaneous breaking of the flavor symmetry. The pion mass vanishes at  $m = c_2a^2/B$ . For even smaller values of  $m$  the charged pions remain massless, while the neutral pion becomes massive again [32].

Negative values of  $c_2$ , on the other hand, imply a first order phase transition with a minimal non-vanishing pion mass. All three pions are massive for all quark masses, and the pion mass assumes its minimal value at  $m = 0$ , resulting in

$$M_{0,\text{min}}^2 = 2|c_2|a^2. \tag{15}$$

<sup>7</sup> GSM stands for *generically small masses*.

<sup>8</sup> Note that our definition for  $c_2$  differs by a factor  $F^2a^2$  from the one in Ref. [32].

Note that magnitude and the sign of  $c_2$  are a priori unknown and depend on the details of the underlying lattice theory, i.e. what particular lattice action has been used.

The PCAC quark mass is defined by the ratio (no sum over  $a$ )

$$m_{\text{PCAC}} = \frac{\langle \partial_\mu A_\mu^a(x) P^a(0) \rangle}{2\langle P^a(x) P^a(0) \rangle}, \quad (16)$$

where angled brackets indicate expectation values. Expanding the current and the density in Eqs. (11) and (12) to  $\mathcal{O}(\xi^a)$  we find

$$A_\mu^a(x) = -iF\partial_\mu\xi^a(x)(1+ac_A), \quad (17)$$

$$P^a(x) = iFB\xi^a(x)(1+ac_P). \quad (18)$$

where here and in the following we for simplicity no longer write subscript “WChPT”. We also introduced the short hand notation

$$c_A = \frac{16}{F^2}2W_0[W_{45} + W_A - W_{10}/4], \quad (19)$$

$$c_P = \frac{16}{F^2}2W_0[W_{68} + W_P], \quad (20)$$

for the combinations of LECs in the effective current and density at this order. The correlation functions in (16) are now easily computed at LO, yielding

$$m_{\text{PCAC}} = \frac{M_0^2}{2B} \left( 1 + a(c_A - c_P) \right). \quad (21)$$

Using the tree-level pion mass obtained above we find

$$\text{GSM regime : } m_{\text{PCAC}} = m \left( 1 + a(c_A - c_P) \right), \quad (22)$$

$$\text{Aoki regime : } m_{\text{PCAC}} = \left( m - \frac{c_2}{B}a^2 \right) \left( 1 + a(c_A - c_P) \right). \quad (23)$$

In the GSM regime the result is rather simple and the PCAC mass is equal to the shifted quark mass, up to corrections of  $\mathcal{O}(ma)$ . This is no longer true in the Aoki regime. Still, the contribution proportional to  $(c_A - c_P)$  is subleading and can be ignored if one works to leading order in the quark mass.

Equations (22) and (23) allow to replace the shifted mass  $m$ , which is just a parameter in the chiral Lagrangian, with the PCAC quark mass. The latter is an observable which is often used in lattice simulations.

Note that the results above reproduce a well-known fact, namely that the PCAC mass depends on the particular renormalization conditions imposed on the axial vector current and the pseudo scalar density. Different renormalization conditions show up as different values of  $c_A$  and  $c_P$ .

### III. WCHPT IN THE EPSILON REGIME

#### A. Continuum ChPT in finite volume

Consider continuum QCD with  $N_f$  degenerate quark masses in a hypercubic volume  $V = TL^3$ , with  $T, L \gg 1/\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ . Finite-size effects can be systematically studied by means of the corresponding chiral effective theory [1, 2, 44]. In this section we summarize the main aspects of finite-volume chiral perturbation theory in the continuum.

If the pion Compton wavelength is much smaller than the size of the box,  $M_\pi L \gg 1$ , finite-volume effects can be treated in the chiral effective theory by adopting the standard  $p$ -expansion, where the power-counting in terms of the momentum  $p$  is given by

$$m \sim O(p^2), \quad 1/L, 1/T, \partial_\mu \sim O(p), \quad \xi \sim O(p). \quad (24)$$

For asymptotically large volumes, one expects the finite-volume effects to be exponentially suppressed by factors  $\sim e^{-M_\pi L}$ .

On the other hand, approaching the chiral limit by keeping  $\mu = m\Sigma V \lesssim O(1)$  (but still  $L \gg 1/\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ ), where  $\Sigma = F^2 B$  is the quark condensate in the chiral limit, one explores the domain where the pion wavelength is larger than the size of the box,  $M_\pi L < 1$ . In this case the pion zero-mode gives a contribution to the propagator proportional to  $1/M_0^2 V$ , which cannot be treated perturbatively but has to be computed exactly [1, 2]. This is achieved by factorizing the pseudo Nambu-Goldstone boson fields as

$$U(x) = \exp\left(\frac{2i}{F}\xi(x)\right) U_0, \quad (25)$$

where the constant  $U_0 \in SU(N_f)$  represents the collective zero-mode. The nonzero modes parametrized by  $\xi$ , on the other hand, can still be treated perturbatively and satisfy the condition

$$\int_V d^4x \xi(x) = 0, \quad (26)$$

since the constant mode has been separated.

The zero-mode contribution proportional to  $1/M_0^2 V$  in the pion propagator diverges in the chiral limit and a reordering of the perturbation series that sums all graphs with an arbitrary number of zero-mode propagators is necessary [2]. This reordering is achieved with the power counting

$$m \sim O(\epsilon^4), \quad 1/L, 1/T, \partial_\mu \sim O(\epsilon), \quad \xi \sim O(\epsilon). \quad (27)$$

Mass effects are suppressed compared to the  $p$ -regime, while volume effects are enhanced and become polynomial in  $(FL)^{-2}$ . Since  $M_0^2$  is proportional to  $m$  the combination  $1/M_0^2 V$  now counts as  $\epsilon^0$ . Consequently, all graphs that exclusively involve zero-mode propagators count as  $O(1)$  and are unsuppressed. The key point here is, that the counting of the quark



mass is dictated by the counting of  $L$  by demanding  $1/M_0^2 V = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^0)$ . We will use this in the next section in order to establish the counting rules in WChPT.

With the factorization given in Eq. (25), the leading order continuum partition function in the  $\epsilon$ -regime is given by

$$Z = \int_{SU(N_f)} [dU_0] \int [d\xi] \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_V d^4x \text{Tr}(\partial_\mu \xi \partial_\mu \xi) + \frac{m \Sigma V}{2} \text{Tr}(U_0 + U_0^\dagger) \right\}. \quad (28)$$

The integration over the perturbative degrees of freedom  $[d\xi]$  gives rise to the usual Wick contractions, while the zero-mode integrals over  $[dU_0]$  must be computed exactly. Notice that by going to  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$ , by factoring out the constant zero-mode from the measure, one obtains

$$[dU] = [d\xi][dU_0] (1 + A(\xi) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4)), \quad (29)$$

with

$$A(\xi) = -\frac{2N_f}{3F^2} \frac{1}{V} \int_V d^4x \text{Tr}(\xi^2(x)) \quad (30)$$

for a general value of  $N_f$  [2, 45].

## B. Power countings for the epsilon regime in WChPT

Like the continuum effective theory, WChPT can also be formulated in a finite volume, in particular the  $\epsilon$ -regime discussed in this section.

In WChPT we have additional low-energy constants and the lattice spacing as an additional expansion parameter. The main task is to decide how to count these in the epsilon expansion.

Just as the continuum LECs  $F$  and  $\Sigma$ , we count all the additional LECs associated with the lattice spacing to be of order  $\epsilon^0$ ,

$$c_2, c_A, c_P \sim \mathcal{O}(1). \quad (31)$$

The counting of the lattice spacing  $a$  is more complicated. The general strategy is to follow the infinite-volume procedure and determine the power counting depending on the relative size of  $m$  and  $a$ . At finite volume, once the counting of  $m$  is fixed by the counting of  $L$ , we obtain the counting of  $a$ .

We start with the GSM regime. The LO Lagrangian and the pion mass  $M_0^2$  are as in the continuum  $\epsilon$ -regime, so we conclude  $m \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4)$  by the same arguments as in the previous section. Since the GSM regime is defined by  $m \sim a \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2$  we are immediately lead to  $a \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4)$ .

The Aoki regime is more subtle. According to our assumption, the pion mass  $M_0^2$ , given in (14), is now a sum of two terms of equal order. If  $c_2 < 0$ , it is a sum of two positive terms. Hence, a small pion mass of order  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4)$  implies that both terms,  $2Bm$  and  $2|c_2|a^2$  are small too and also of order  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4)$ .

If  $c_2$  is positive, the pion mass is the difference of two positive contributions. This leaves the possibility that  $M_0^2$  is small, even though the individual terms  $2Bm$  and  $2|c_2|a^2$  may not be small and only their difference is. A pion mass of order  $\epsilon^4$  may be obtained by the difference of two order  $\epsilon^2$  or  $\epsilon^3$  terms, for example.

We do not think that this is a likely scenario. Present day lattice simulations are usually done with small lattice spacings less than 0.1 fm and the  $O(a^2)$  corrections are expected to be small in this case. Hence, we *assume* that  $a^2 \sim O(\epsilon^4)$  in the Aoki regime. This assumption, together with the requirement  $M_0^2 \sim O(\epsilon^4)$  then also leads to  $m \sim O(\epsilon^4)$ , the same counting as for  $c_2 < 0$ .

The epsilon expansion allows us to introduce yet another regime where we count  $a \sim \epsilon^3$ . Just by the powers of  $\epsilon$  this is an intermediate regime between the GSM and Aoki regime. One may think about it as the GSM regime but at a larger lattice spacing (or smaller quark mass). Its usefulness will become clear in the next section when we discuss the epsilon expansion of correlation functions.

All three countings we introduced are well defined and are appropriate for a particular relative size between  $m$  and  $a$ . In order to be able to refer to these regimes we introduce the following nomenclature:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GSM regime :} & \quad a \sim O(\epsilon^4), \\ \text{GSM* regime :} & \quad a \sim O(\epsilon^3), \\ \text{Aoki regime :} & \quad a \sim O(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

For fixed values of  $m$  and  $a$  in a given regime, one can match for instance the time-dependence of current correlators with lattice QCD results in order to extract the corresponding LECs.

### C. Epsilon expansion of correlation functions

We will be interested in correlators of the pseudo scalar density and the axial vector current. These correlators have been calculated before through NNLO in continuum ChPT [45]. In powers of  $\epsilon$  this corresponds to  $O(\epsilon^4)$  for the  $\langle P^a(x)P^a(0) \rangle$  correlator and  $O(\epsilon^8)$  for  $\langle A_\mu^a(x)A_\mu^a(0) \rangle$ .

In order to discuss the epsilon expansion in WChPT let us split an arbitrary operator and the action in WChPT into the continuum part and a remainder proportional to powers of  $a$ ,

$$O(x) = O_{\text{ct}}(x) + \delta O(x), \tag{33}$$

$$S = S_{\text{ct}} + \delta S. \tag{34}$$

Expectation values are generically defined as

$$\langle O \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \int [dU] e^{-S} O, \tag{35}$$

where  $Z$  is the partition function

$$Z = \int [dU] e^{-S}. \quad (36)$$

The two-point correlator  $\langle O_1(x) O_2(0) \rangle = \langle O_1 O_2 \rangle$  (for notational simplicity we suppress the dependence on  $x$ ) can then be written according to

$$\langle O_1 O_2 \rangle_W = \langle O_{1,\text{ct}} O_{2,\text{ct}} \rangle + \delta \langle O_1 O_2 \rangle, \quad (37)$$

$$\delta \langle O_1 O_2 \rangle = \langle O_{1,\text{ct}} \delta O_2 + \delta O_1 O_{2,\text{ct}} \rangle - \langle O_{1,\text{ct}} O_{2,\text{ct}} \delta S \rangle + \langle O_{1,\text{ct}} O_{2,\text{ct}} \rangle \langle \delta S \rangle. \quad (38)$$

Here we have approximated  $\exp(-\delta S) \approx 1 - \delta S$  and we dropped all higher corrections. Note that the expectation value on the left hand side of (37), labelled with a subscript “W”, is defined with the full action  $S$  in the Boltzmann factor, while on the right hand side it is defined with  $S_{\text{ct}}$  only (for notational simplicity we suppress a subscript “ct”).

The discretization corrections for the pseudo scalar and the axial vector can be read off from (11) and (12). For what matters here we can simplify these expressions. We are interested in the power counting for the epsilon expansion, and for this we can ignore all constants which count as  $O(1)$ . Therefore, we write

$$\delta P^a \propto a(\text{Tr}(U + U^\dagger) + 1) P_{\text{ct}}^a. \quad (39)$$

$\delta P^a$  is proportional to the continuum density itself. As mentioned before, the epsilon expansion of  $P_{\text{ct}}^a$  starts with  $O(\epsilon^0)$ . The “scalar density”  $\text{Tr}(U + U^\dagger)$  also starts at  $O(\epsilon^0)$ . Hence, by considering the continuum contribution at LO, the leading correction in the epsilon expansion due to lattice terms is completely determined by how we count the lattice spacing  $a$ . In the last section we defined three different countings, so for now we leave it unspecified, write  $a \sim \epsilon^{n_a}$  where  $n_a$  counts the epsilon powers for  $a$ , and obtain

$$\delta P^a \sim \epsilon^{n_a}. \quad (40)$$

Note that the symbol  $\sim$  stands here just for the leading lattice contribution in the epsilon expansion.

Analogously, we find for the axial vector (dropping again irrelevant constants)

$$\delta A_\mu^a \propto a[(\text{Tr}(U + U^\dagger) + 1) A_{\mu,\text{ct}}^a + \partial_\mu \text{Tr}(T^a(U - U^\dagger))]. \quad (41)$$

Both,  $A_{\mu,\text{ct}}^a$  and  $\partial_\mu \text{Tr}(T^a(U - U^\dagger))$  have an open Lorentz index and, therefore, contain at least one derivative acting on at least one power of  $\xi(x)$ . Hence, their continuum epsilon expansion starts at  $O(\epsilon^2)$  and we find for the leading lattice corrections

$$\delta A_\mu^a \sim \epsilon^{n_a+2}. \quad (42)$$

Finally, we have to take into account the lattice corrections due to the contribution  $\delta S$ . It will be useful to split them into two parts. The first one, denoted by  $\delta S_a$ , contains the terms

of  $\mathcal{L}_a$  in (3). These terms start at  $O(\epsilon^{n_a})$  (having taken into account  $\epsilon^{-4}$  from the integration over space-time),

$$\delta S_a \sim \epsilon^{n_a}. \quad (43)$$

The second contribution,  $\delta S_{a^2}$ , contains only the  $a^2$  term proportional to  $c_2$ . Therefore, it counts as

$$\delta S_{a^2} \sim \epsilon^{2n_a-4}. \quad (44)$$

After these preparations we can determine at which order the lattice spacing effects enter the PP and the AA correlator.

### 1. GSM regime

In the GSM regime we set  $n_a = 4$  and find

$$\delta \langle P^a(x) P^a(0) \rangle \sim O(\epsilon^4), \quad (45)$$

$$\delta \langle A_\mu^a(x) A_\mu^a(0) \rangle \sim O(\epsilon^8). \quad (46)$$

The corrections due to the lattice spacing first affect both correlators at NNLO. Up to NLO the results obtained in continuum ChPT are the appropriate ones. This is quite remarkable and may explain why numerical data generated recently [22] could be fitted very well using the NLO continuum expressions. Note that this suppression to NNLO holds for the unimproved theory. The reason is that the terms linear in  $a$  are accompanied by at least one additional power of  $m$  or  $\partial_\mu \xi$ , and are therefore of higher order.

### 2. GSM\* regime

Here we have  $n_a = 3$  and obtain

$$\delta \langle P^a(x) P^a(0) \rangle \sim O(\epsilon^2), \quad (47)$$

$$\delta \langle A_\mu^a(x) A_\mu^a(0) \rangle \sim O(\epsilon^6), \quad (48)$$

hence the corrections enter at NLO. Interestingly, the dominant term here comes only from the correction  $\delta S_{a^2}$ . The other corrections from the  $O(a)$  contributions in the currents, densities and  $\delta S_a$  start at  $\epsilon^3$  and  $\epsilon^7$ , respectively. Therefore, they are of higher order in the epsilon expansion, even though they are still lower than the NNLO contributions, which start at  $\epsilon^4$  and  $\epsilon^8$ , respectively.

Notice that in the GSM and GSM\* regimes the leading order partition function is like the continuum one given in Eq. (28). In particular, the exact zero-mode integrals are computed with respect to the same Boltzmann factor as in continuum ChPT.

### 3. Aoki regime

The modifications in the Aoki regime are more pronounced than in the previously discussed regimes. Here, cut-off effects show up already at LO. Even worse, the corrections can no longer be linearly added to the continuum result. The reason is the correction  $\delta S_{a^2}$ , which gives a zero-mode contribution of order  $\epsilon^0$ . Hence, it is no longer justified to expand completely the exponential  $\exp(-S_{a^2}) \approx 1 - S_{a^2}$ . The zero-mode contribution of order  $\epsilon^0$  has to be included in the leading order Boltzmann factor. That is, the partition function becomes

$$Z_{\text{Aoki}} = \int_{SU(2)} [dU_0] \int [d\xi] \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_V d^4x \text{Tr}(\partial_\mu \xi \partial_\mu \xi) + \frac{m\Sigma V}{2} \text{Tr}(U_0 + U_0^\dagger) - \frac{c_2 F^2 a^2 V}{16} (\text{Tr}(U_0 + U_0^\dagger))^2 \right\}. \quad (49)$$

This modification affects all constant integrals and probably leads to non-trivial changes of the continuum results. Note that the other  $O(a)$  corrections (from  $\delta O$  and  $\delta S_a$ ) are of order  $\epsilon^2$  and show up at NLO only.

### D. Comment on $O(a)$ improvement

The results in the previous section are valid for unimproved Wilson fermions. It is natural to ask how (non-perturbative)  $O(a)$ -improvement changes these results.

If the theory is non-perturbatively improved the corrections  $\delta O$  and  $\delta S_a$  are absent, and modifications are caused by  $\delta S_{a^2}$  only. We have seen that this term is the dominant correction and the others are subleading. Consequently, the epsilon expansion is essentially unaltered for the improved theory, since only subleading terms vanish.

## IV. LEADING CORRECTION IN THE GSM\* REGIME

We already mentioned in the introduction that the epsilon expansion is advantageous for the determination of  $F$  and  $\Sigma$ , since the Gasser-Leutwyler coefficients first enter the ChPT formulae at NNLO. The same is true for WChPT in the GSM regime, where the additional lattice spacing contributions enter at NNLO too. In other words, working through NLO the results for the GSM regime are the same as those in continuum ChPT.

The first non-trivial modification of the continuum NLO results appears in the GSM\* regime, and in this section we compute the leading correction to the PP and AA correlator; the results for some other correlators are given in appendix C. This correction is caused by the constant term of the  $\delta S_{a^2}$  contribution,

$$\delta \langle O_1(x) O_2(y) \rangle \Big|_{\text{leading}} = -\langle O_{1,\text{ct}}^{\text{LO}}(x) O_{2,\text{ct}}^{\text{LO}}(y) \delta S_{a^2} \rangle + \langle O_{1,\text{ct}}^{\text{LO}}(x) O_{2,\text{ct}}^{\text{LO}}(y) \rangle \langle \delta S_{a^2} \rangle, \quad (50)$$

where

$$\delta S_{a^2} = \frac{\rho}{16} (\text{Tr}(U_0 + U_0^\dagger))^2. \quad (51)$$

The superscript “LO” refers to leading order in the  $\epsilon$ -expansion and we have introduced the dimensionless quantity

$$\rho = F^2 c_2 a^2 V. \quad (52)$$

Notice that if  $\langle O_{1,\text{ct}}^{\text{LO}}(x) O_{2,\text{ct}}^{\text{LO}}(y) \delta S_{a^2} \rangle = \langle O_{1,\text{ct}}^{\text{LO}}(x) O_{2,\text{ct}}^{\text{LO}}(y) \rangle \langle \delta S_{a^2} \rangle$ , i.e for disconnected insertions, the leading correction in Eq. (50) vanishes. This happens for instance for left handed (V-A) current correlators [46], and more general for correlators which do not get zero-mode contributions at leading order.

The epsilon expansion in continuum ChPT allows predictions for fixed topological sectors [6]. Since chiral symmetry is explicitly broken in lattice QCD with Wilson fermions, an exact definition for the topological charge does not exist at nonzero lattice spacing. For this reason we will only give results for observables where the sum over all topological sectors has been performed.

## A. Preliminaries

Calculations of mesonic 2-point functions in the  $\epsilon$ -regime have been pioneered in Ref. [45]. The integration over the non-constant modes  $\xi(x)$  is done perturbatively as in ordinary chiral perturbation theory in the p-regime. We summarize the corresponding propagators and other useful properties in Appendix A.

The integral over the constant mode  $U_0$  has to be done exactly. In our particular case with  $N_f = 2$  we encounter integrals of the type

$$\langle g(U_0) \rangle = \frac{1}{Z_0} \int_{SU(2)} [dU_0] g(U_0) e^{\frac{\mu}{2} \text{Tr}(U_0 + U_0^\dagger)}, \quad (53)$$

where  $Z_0$  is the continuum partition function associated to the zero modes,

$$Z_0 = \int_{SU(2)} [dU_0] e^{\frac{\mu}{2} \text{Tr}(U_0 + U_0^\dagger)}, \quad (54)$$

and  $\mu$  denotes the standard combination

$$\mu = m \Sigma V. \quad (55)$$

Quite generally, the integral (53) leads, at least for the types of  $g$  we are considering, to expressions involving modified Bessel functions  $I_n(z)$  with integer index  $n$ . They satisfy numerous recursion relations [47] which allow us to express all integrals in terms of two Bessel functions, which we choose to be  $I_2$  and  $I_1$ . In Appendix B we collect various integrals that one encounters in calculating the PP and AA correlator in the GSM\* regime.

As an example let us consider the expectation value of the quantity  $\delta S_{a^2}$ , defined in Eq. (51), that is part of the correction in (50). By using the integrals given in the Appendix we obtain

$$\langle \delta S_{a^2} \rangle = \rho \left( 1 - \frac{3}{2\mu} \frac{I_2(2\mu)}{I_1(2\mu)} \right). \quad (56)$$

## B. The PP correlator

For the PP correlator we introduce the definition

$$\langle P^a(x) P^b(y) \rangle = \delta^{ab} C_{PP}(x-y), \quad (57)$$

which takes into account translation invariance and the trivial dependence on the flavor indices. In the GSM\* regime,  $C_{PP}(x-y)$  can be written through NLO as the sum of the continuum correlator and a correction proportional to  $a^2$ ,

$$C_{PP}(x-y) = C_{PP,\text{ct}}(x-y) + C_{PP,a^2}(x-y). \quad (58)$$

The continuum correlator for generic  $N_f$  at NLO (which corresponds to  $O(\epsilon^2)$ ) is given by [45] (see also [48])

$$C_{PP,\text{ct}}(x-y) = C_P + \alpha_P \bar{G}(x-y), \quad (59)$$

where  $\bar{G}(x-y)$  is the finite-volume massless scalar propagator defined in Eq. (A1) and

$$C_P = -\frac{\Sigma_{\text{eff}}^2}{8(N_f^2 - 1)} \left[ \langle \text{Tr}[(U_0 - U_0^\dagger)^2] \rangle_{\text{eff}} - \frac{1}{N_f} \langle [\text{Tr}(U_0 - U_0^\dagger)]^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}} \right], \quad (60)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_P = \frac{\Sigma^2}{4F^2(N_f^2 - 1)} & \left[ 2N_f^2 - 4 - \frac{2}{N_f} \langle \text{Tr}(U_0^2) + \text{Tr}(U_0^{\dagger 2}) \rangle \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{2}{N_f^2} \langle \text{Tr}(U_0) \text{Tr}(U_0^\dagger) \rangle + \left( \frac{N_f^2 + 1}{N_f^2} \right) \langle (\text{Tr} U_0)^2 + (\text{Tr} U_0^\dagger)^2 \rangle \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

The expectation values with the subscript “eff” are defined like in Eq. (53) with  $\mu$  replaced by

$$\mu_{\text{eff}} = m \Sigma_{\text{eff}} V, \quad (62)$$

where  $\Sigma_{\text{eff}}$  is the quark condensate at one loop[45]

$$\Sigma_{\text{eff}} = \Sigma \left( 1 + \frac{N_f^2 - 1}{N_f} \frac{1}{F^2} \frac{\beta_1}{\sqrt{V}} \right). \quad (63)$$

$\beta_1$  is a so-called *shape factor* and is defined in Eq. (A5).

For the particular case  $N_f = 2$ , after the explicit computation of the zero-mode integrals according to Appendix B, one gets

$$C_P = \frac{\Sigma_{\text{eff}}^2}{2\mu_{\text{eff}}} \frac{I_2(2\mu_{\text{eff}})}{I_1(2\mu_{\text{eff}})}, \quad (64)$$

$$\alpha_P = \frac{\Sigma^2}{2F^2} \left[ 2 - \frac{1}{\mu} \frac{I_2(2\mu)}{I_1(2\mu)} \right]. \quad (65)$$

For the leading lattice correction to the continuum result, as given in Eq. (50), we find the  $O(\epsilon^2)$  contribution

$$C_{PP,a^2} = \rho \frac{\Sigma^2}{2} \Delta_{PP}, \quad (66)$$

with

$$\Delta_{PP} = \frac{5\mu I_1^2(2\mu) - 10I_1(2\mu)I_2(2\mu) - 3\mu I_2^2(2\mu)}{2\mu^3 I_1^2(2\mu)}. \quad (67)$$

Interestingly, the correction  $\Delta_{PP}$  is finite in the limit  $\mu \rightarrow 0$ , as is easily checked using the leading order Taylor expansions for the Bessel functions [47],  $I_1(2\mu) \sim \mu$  and  $I_2(2\mu) \sim \mu^2/2$ . We are not aware of a rigorous argument that  $\Delta_{PP}$  has to be regular at vanishing  $\mu$ , since this correction ceases to be valid for small enough quark mass where one enters the Aoki regime. A singularity at  $\mu = 0$  would have been a clear signal for this breakdown of our calculation, however, this signal is not present in the result, at least not at the order in the chiral expansion we are working here.

For the matching with numerical results obtained in lattice simulations we are interested in the correlation function integrated over the spatial components,

$$C_{PP}(t) = \int d^3\vec{x} C_{PP}(x-y) \Big|_{y=0} = C_{PP,\text{ct}}(t) + \frac{L^3 \Sigma^2}{2} \rho \Delta_{PP}, \quad (68)$$

where

$$C_{PP,\text{ct}}(t) = \frac{L^3 \Sigma_{\text{eff}}^2}{2} \frac{I_2(2\mu_{\text{eff}})}{\mu_{\text{eff}} I_1(2\mu_{\text{eff}})} + \frac{T \Sigma^2}{2F^2} h_1(t/T) \left[ 2 - \frac{1}{\mu} \frac{I_2(2\mu)}{I_1(2\mu)} \right]. \quad (69)$$

The time dependence is given by the parabolic function  $h_1$  defined in Eq. (A9).

### C. The AA correlator

The AA correlator is computed along the same lines. For simplicity we consider the time-component correlator and we define

$$\langle A_0^a(x) A_0^b(y) \rangle = \delta^{ab} C_{AA}(x-y). \quad (70)$$

Similarly to the PP correlator we split  $C_{AA}$  at NLO into a continuum part and a correction proportional to the lattice spacing,

$$C_{AA}(x-y) = C_{AA,\text{ct}}(x-y) + C_{AA,a^2}(x-y). \quad (71)$$

The continuum contribution at  $O(\epsilon^6)$  for  $x \neq y$  and generic  $N_f$  has been calculated before [45] (see also [49]) and is given by

$$C_{AA,\text{ct}}(x-y) = \alpha_A \partial_{x_0} \partial_{y_0} \bar{G}(x-y) + \beta_A K_{00}(x-y) + \gamma_A \partial_{x_0} \partial_{y_0} H(x-y), \quad (72)$$



where the following short hand notation has been introduced:

$$\alpha_A = \frac{F^2}{2} \langle \mathcal{J}_0 \rangle_{\text{eff}} + \frac{N_f}{2} \frac{\beta_1}{\sqrt{V}} \langle \mathcal{J}_0 \rangle, \quad (73)$$

$$\beta_A = \frac{N_f}{2} (2 - \langle \mathcal{J}_0 \rangle), \quad (74)$$

$$\gamma_A = \langle \text{Tr}(U_0 + U_0^\dagger) \rangle \frac{\mu}{N_f}. \quad (75)$$

The functions  $K_{\mu\nu}$  and  $H$  are given in Eqs. (A7) and (A8). Moreover, we have introduced the quantity

$$\mathcal{J}_0 = \frac{1}{N_f^2 - 1} \left[ \text{Tr} U_0 \text{Tr} U_0^\dagger + N_f^2 - 2 \right]. \quad (76)$$

Like for the PP correlator, the subscript “eff” refers to the substitution  $\mu \rightarrow \mu_{\text{eff}}$  in the zero-mode integrals. For the particular case we are considering,  $N_f = 2$ , the results (73) – (75) reduce to

$$\alpha_A = F^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{I_2(2\mu_{\text{eff}})}{\mu_{\text{eff}} I_1(2\mu_{\text{eff}})} \right] + 2 \frac{\beta_1}{\sqrt{V}} \left[ 1 - \frac{I_2(2\mu)}{\mu I_1(2\mu)} \right], \quad (77)$$

$$\beta_A = \frac{2 I_2(2\mu)}{\mu I_1(2\mu)}, \quad (78)$$

$$\gamma_A = \frac{2\mu I_2(2\mu)}{I_1(2\mu)}. \quad (79)$$

In analogy to the PP correlator, the  $O(a^2)$  contribution can be computed according to Eq. (50), and we obtain

$$C_{AA,a^2}(x-y) = \frac{F^2}{2} \partial_{x_0} \partial_{y_0} \bar{G}(x-y) \rho \Delta_{AA}, \quad (80)$$

with

$$\Delta_{AA} = \frac{-5\mu I_1^2(2\mu) + 10I_1(2\mu)I_2(2\mu) + 3\mu I_2(2\mu)^2}{\mu^3 I_1^2(2\mu)} = -2\Delta_{PP}. \quad (81)$$

Note that this correction affects only the coefficient  $\alpha_A$  in Eq. (77), which will be modified by the presence of lattice artifacts.

The  $O(a^2)$  correction is, up to a sign and a factor two, the same as the correction for the PP correlator. As far as we can see there is no deeper reason for this. It is simply a consequence of the fact that the zero-mode integrals for the leading order continuum PP and AA correlator are very similar, both lead to the same contribution involving the ratio  $I_2(2\mu)/\mu I_1(2\mu)$ .

By integrating over the spatial coordinates and using the properties listed in Appendix A, we obtain for  $t \neq 0$

$$C_{AA}(t) = \int d^3\vec{x} C_{AA}(x-y)|_{y=0} = C_{AA,\text{ct}}(t) - \frac{F^2}{2T} \rho \Delta_{AA}, \quad (82)$$

where the continuum for  $N_f = 2$  explicitly reads

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{AA,\text{ct}}(t) &= -\frac{1}{T}\alpha_A + \frac{T}{V}k_{00}\beta_A - \frac{T}{V}\gamma_A h_1\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) = \\
&= -\frac{F^2}{T}\left(1 - \frac{I_2(2\mu_{\text{eff}})}{\mu_{\text{eff}}I_1(2\mu_{\text{eff}})}\right) - \frac{2\beta_1}{T\sqrt{V}}\left(1 - \frac{I_2(2\mu)}{\mu I_1(2\mu)}\right) + \\
&+ \frac{2T}{V}k_{00}\frac{I_2(2\mu)}{\mu I_1(2\mu)} - \frac{2T}{V}h_1(t/T)\frac{\mu I_2(2\mu)}{I_1(2\mu)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

Here  $k_{00}$  is another shape factor defined in the appendix, Eq. (A6).

#### D. The PCAC mass

The correlators in the previous section are given as functions of  $m$ , the shifted mass. This is the mass parameter in the chiral Lagrangian and a priori not an observable. Here we compute the PCAC mass, defined in (16), and use it in the next section to replace  $m$  with  $m_{\text{PCAC}}$ .

We have already calculated the denominator of (16), and the numerator can be done analogously. Let us define

$$\langle \partial_\mu A_\mu^a(x) P^b(y) \rangle = \delta^{ab} C_{\partial AP}(x - y). \tag{84}$$

To leading order in the epsilon expansion we find the result

$$C_{\partial AP,\text{ct}}(x - y) = \frac{\Sigma}{V} \frac{I_2(2\mu)}{I_1(2\mu)}. \tag{85}$$

Dividing this by the leading order result of  $2C_{PP,\text{ct}}$  in Eq. (59) we obtain

$$m_{\text{PCAC}} = \frac{\mu}{\Sigma V} = m. \tag{86}$$

This is just the result of continuum ChPT, where it is not surprising because the PCAC mass stems from the PCAC Ward identity. Note, however, that both numerator and denominator contain non-trivial Bessel functions which cancel in the ratio. This cancellation will no longer happen with the lattice spacing corrections included, since the PCAC relation no longer holds.

The leading correction to the numerator in the GSM\* regime is given by (50) with  $O_1 = \partial_\mu A^a(x)$  and  $O_2 = P^a(y)$  (no sum over  $a$ ). The computation is straightforward as the ones in the previous sections and we find

$$C_{\partial AP}(x - y) = \frac{\Sigma}{V} \frac{I_2(2\mu)}{I_1(2\mu)} \left[ 1 - \frac{3\rho}{2\mu^2} \left( 2 - \frac{\mu I_1(2\mu)}{I_2(2\mu)} + \frac{\mu I_2(2\mu)}{I_1(2\mu)} \right) \right]. \tag{87}$$

Dividing by  $2C_{PP}$  given in (58) we obtain the leading  $O(a^2)$  corrections to the PCAC mass:

$$m_{\text{PCAC}} = m \left[ 1 + \rho \left( \frac{2}{\mu^2} - \frac{I_1(2\mu)}{\mu I_2(2\mu)} \right) \right]. \tag{88}$$

The key observation here is that the PCAC mass is equal to  $m$ , up to a correction of  $O(ma^2V)$ , which is  $\epsilon^2$  higher in the epsilon expansion in the GSM\* regime.

### E. The correlators as a function of the PCAC mass

The final step we have to do is to replace  $m$  by  $m_{\text{PCAC}}$  in the correlators. We first invert result (88),

$$\mu = \tilde{\mu} \left[ 1 - \rho \left( \frac{2}{\tilde{\mu}^2} - \frac{I_1(2\tilde{\mu})}{\tilde{\mu} I_2(2\tilde{\mu})} \right) \right], \quad (89)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mu} = m_{\text{PCAC}} \Sigma V. \quad (90)$$

In the NLO contributions of the correlators we can simply replace  $m = m_{\text{PCAC}}$ ,  $\mu = \tilde{\mu}$ , since the corrections are higher than this order. In the LO term, however, we have to use the full expression (89), which gives rise to additional corrections proportional to  $\rho$ .

Eq. (89) has to be inserted into the Bessel functions  $I_n(2\mu)$ . Since the correction proportional to  $\rho$  is  $\epsilon^2$  higher in the epsilon expansion we can Taylor-expand,

$$I_n(2\mu) = I_n(2\tilde{\mu}) - 2\rho\tilde{\mu}I'_n(2\tilde{\mu}) \left( \frac{2}{\tilde{\mu}^2} - \frac{I_1(2\tilde{\mu})}{\tilde{\mu} I_2(2\tilde{\mu})} \right) + \dots \quad (91)$$

and drop the higher order terms. The final results for the correlators can be brought into the form

$$C_{PP}(t) = C_{PP,\text{ct}}(t) + \frac{L^3 \Sigma^2}{2} \rho \Delta_{a^2}, \quad (92)$$

$$C_{AA}(t) = C_{AA,\text{ct}}(t) + \frac{F^2}{T} \rho \Delta_{a^2}, \quad (93)$$

where the continuum correlators are as in (69) and (83), but with the replacements  $\mu \rightarrow \tilde{\mu}$  and  $\mu_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mu}_{\text{eff}}$ , with

$$\tilde{\mu}_{\text{eff}} = m_{\text{PCAC}} \Sigma_{\text{eff}} V. \quad (94)$$

The correction  $\Delta_{a^2}$ , which depends on  $\tilde{\mu}$ , captures the lattice spacing artifacts and reads

$$\Delta_{a^2} = \frac{4\tilde{\mu}^2 I_1^3(2\tilde{\mu}) - 11\tilde{\mu} I_1^2(2\tilde{\mu}) I_2(2\tilde{\mu}) + 2(3 - 2\tilde{\mu}^2) I_1(2\tilde{\mu}) I_2^2(2\tilde{\mu}) + 5\tilde{\mu} I_2^3(2\tilde{\mu})}{2\tilde{\mu}^3 I_1^2(2\tilde{\mu}) I_2(2\tilde{\mu})}. \quad (95)$$

Note that it is regular at  $\tilde{\mu} = 0$ .

Eqs. (92) and (93) are our final results for the GSM\* regime. (In Appendix C we also give the corresponding expression for the vector current correlator.) These results are remarkable and perhaps surprising in two ways: (i) The  $\tilde{\mu}$  dependence of the  $\mathcal{O}(a^2)$  correction is identical for both correlation functions. (ii) Besides the continuum LECs  $F$  and  $\Sigma$  only one more unknown LEC enters these expression, the parameter  $c_2$ . The second feature is very advantageous in practice when our results are used to fit numerical lattice data.

A different question is the actual size of the  $\mathcal{O}(a^2)$  correction, which is directly proportional to  $c_2$ . In the next section we try to give at least a rough answer to this question.

## V. NUMERICAL TESTS

### A. General considerations

For the pseudo scalar and axial vector correlators, the leading  $O(a^2)$  correction in the GSM\* regime is just a shift of the constant part. The question is how big this correction is in a typical  $\epsilon$ -regime simulation. As a measure for the correction we study the ratio

$$R_{XX} = \left| \frac{C_{XX}(T/2) - C_{XX,ct}(T/2)}{C_{XX,ct}(T/2)} \right|, \quad (96)$$

i.e. the relative shift of the correlators at  $T/2$ . The main unknown here is the coefficient  $c_2$ . Even though it plays a decisive role in the phase diagram of the theory [32], it is difficult to obtain in numerical simulations. So far only the ETM collaboration has obtained an estimate from their simulations with a twisted mass term [26, 50]. The data for the pion mass splitting together with the LO ChPT prediction gives the rough estimate  $-2c_2a^2 \approx (185\text{MeV})^2$  at  $a \approx 0.086\text{fm}$ , which translates into  $|c_2| \approx (550\text{MeV})^4$ . The error, however, is fairly large because of the large statistical error in the determination of the neutral pion mass. In addition, this value for  $c_2$  was obtained with the tree-level Symanzik improved gauge action and the standard Wilson fermion action, and any change in this setup can and probably will lead to a different value for  $c_2$ .<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, for lack of a better estimate we use  $|c_2| = (500\text{MeV})^4$  in the following.

For the other parameters we use  $F = 90\text{MeV}$ ,  $a = 0.08\text{fm}$  and a hypercubic lattice with  $N_T = N_L = 24$ , which corresponds to a box size  $L = 1.92\text{fm}$ . This implies  $\rho \approx 0.75$ . Even though this is slightly large we may still count this as  $O(\epsilon^2)$  as it should in order to be in the GSM\* regime.

Figure 1 shows  $R_{PP}$  and  $R_{AA}$  for  $\tilde{\mu}$  values in the  $\epsilon$ -regime. For  $\tilde{\mu} = 1.0$  we find  $R_{PP} = 2.8\%$  and it decreases to less than 1% for  $\tilde{\mu}$  larger than 2. The correction is maximal (less than 5%) at vanishing  $\tilde{\mu}$ . However, for  $\tilde{\mu} \sim \rho$  we enter the Aoki regime and our formulae are no longer valid. The values for  $R_{AA}$  are very similar. For instance,  $R_{AA} = 2.1\%$  at  $\tilde{\mu} = 1.0$ .

Figure 1 also shows  $\Delta_{a^2}(\tilde{\mu})$ , which is, up to the factor  $\rho$ , the numerator in (96). It looks very similar to the ratios itself, since the denominator in (96) is of  $O(1)$  and varies only mildly for the  $\tilde{\mu}$  values considered here. So the correction to the correlators is essentially  $\Delta_{a^2}(\tilde{\mu})$ , which happens to be of the order of  $10^{-2}$ .

The main conclusion we can draw from this exercise is that for our choice of parameters the  $O(a^2)$  corrections to the correlators are at the few percent level, a comfortably small value.

Using a bigger box improves the epsilon expansion since the expansion parameter  $1/(FL)^2$  is smaller. However, a bigger box also leads to larger  $\rho$  values and one easily enters the Aoki regime at moderately large volumes. For instance, with  $N_L = 32$  and the other parameters unchanged we get  $L = 2.4\text{ fm}$  and  $\rho \approx 2.4$ , a value that is certainly not  $O(\epsilon^2)$ .<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> An analysis [51] of quenched twisted mass lattice data led to a value  $c_2 \approx (300\text{MeV})^4$ .

<sup>10</sup> It may seem counterintuitive at first that a change in the volume may bring us into a different regime.




FIG. 1:  $R_{PP}$  (dotted) and  $R_{AA}$  (solid) as a function of  $\tilde{\mu}$ . Both ratios are smaller than 3.5% for  $\tilde{\mu} \geq 0.75$ . The dashed curve represents  $\Delta_{a^2}(\tilde{\mu})$ .

### B. Reanalysis of recent lattice data

In this section we investigate the impact of  $c_2$  on the extraction of the continuum low energy constants  $F$  and  $\Sigma$  from lattice data. The data is taken from Refs. [22, 52]. It is generated with  $N_f = 2$  flavors of dynamical improved NHYP Wilson fermions [53] at a fairly small quark mass. From there, a reweighting procedure allows to access even smaller sea quark masses [23]. This procedure is exact and does not introduce systematic uncertainties but allows to compute correlators at very small quark masses at moderate cost. The lattice spacing is  $a \approx 0.115\text{fm}$  from the measurement of the Sommer parameter  $r_0$  taken to be  $0.49\text{fm}$ [54]. We have two volumes available, one at  $L = 16a \approx 1.84\text{fm}$  and a larger one with  $L = 24a \approx 2.8\text{fm}$ . The former serves mainly as a cross check whereas the latter has sufficient size for our NLO formulae to be applicable. Some parameters of the simulation are given in Table I.

The theoretical formulae for the pseudo scalar and axial vector correlator both have the form constant plus parabola. The coefficient  $c_2$  only contributes to the constant term in both cases. The curvature itself is rather small at the parameter values simulated, in particular compared to the statistical uncertainties, see Fig. 2. Therefore, at a fixed mass, each of the two correlators effectively is a constant from which it is difficult to constrain three parameters. As already discussed, the theory predicts a particular and relatively strong

---

However, increasing the volume requires that we need to decrease the mass in order to stay in the  $\epsilon$ -regime with fixed  $\tilde{\mu}$ . Hence we have to decrease  $a$  as well in order to preserve the relative size between the mass and the lattice spacing terms.

$L/a$	$\kappa$	$am_{\text{PCAC}}$	$\mu$
24	0.128150	0.0019(4)	2.1
	0.128125	0.0024(3)	2.7
	0.128100	0.0030(3)	3.4
	0.128050	0.0044(3)	5.0
16	0.128100	0.0028(11)	0.7
	0.128050	0.0047(9)	1.1
	0.128000	0.0058(7)	1.4
	0.127900	0.0088(5)	2.1
	0.127800	0.0117(3)	2.9

TABLE I: Parameters of the simulation.  $L/a$  is the extend of the box,  $\kappa$  the hopping parameters, the PCAC quark mass and an approximate values of  $\mu = m\Sigma V$ , where we use the central value of  $\Sigma$ .

$\tilde{\mu}$  dependence of the term multiplied by  $c_2$ . This gives a handle on the extraction of this coefficient. Therefore we simultaneously fit the axial vector and pseudo scalar correlators for all available quark masses. From a fit to  $t \in [6, 18]$  we get  $\Sigma^{1/3} = 249(4)\text{MeV}$ ,  $F = 88(3)\text{MeV}$  and  $c_2 = 0.02(8)\text{GeV}^4$ . The data, along with the theoretical curves can be found in Fig. 2. Here we used  $Z_P^{\overline{\text{MS}}}(2\text{GeV}) = 0.90(2)$  and  $Z_A = 0.99(2)$  from Ref. [22]. The errors from the renormalization factors are not included in the uncertainties of the LECs. The value of  $c_2$  is compatible with zero within errors and the one sigma band lies within the range of reasonable values for a low energy constant. Since the data points are highly correlated, we cannot give a good estimate for the quality of the fit; we find  $\chi^2/\text{dof} = 0.3(1)$  without the correlations taken into account. We also remark that the results are independent of the fit range once  $t_{\text{min}}/a > 4$ . Another concern are the relatively large values of  $\tilde{\mu}$ . Therefore we repeated the analysis leaving the  $\tilde{\mu} \approx 5$  data out. We get from the same fit range  $\Sigma^{1/3} = 250(4)\text{MeV}$ ,  $F = 87(3)\text{MeV}$  and  $c_2 = -0.01(8)\text{GeV}^4$ . The differences to the previous values are well within the statistical uncertainties. This is encouraging. Even with the additional constant the errors of the continuum LECs are reasonably small.

Is the value we find for  $c_2$  large or not? To gauge the impact of this term, we repeat the fit by setting  $c_2 = 0$ . The results are virtually unchanged within errors:  $\Sigma^{1/3} = 249(4)\text{MeV}$ ,  $F = 88(3)\text{MeV}$ . This is very good news. The cut-off effects are so small that they do not impact the extraction of the low energy constants beyond the level of the statistical uncertainties.

As a cross check we repeated this analysis on the smaller volume, at the same lattice spacing and  $L/a = 16$ . We obtain  $\Sigma^{1/3} = 257(4)\text{MeV}$ ,  $F = 83(2)\text{MeV}$  and  $c_2 = 0.06(14)\text{GeV}^4$ . However, the (uncorrelated)  $\chi^2/\text{dof} = 1.3$  might indicate that the NLO formulae are no longer applicable. These results agree with the findings of Ref. [22].




FIG. 2: Fit of the WChPT predictions to lattice data. All data points within the fit range of  $t/a \in [6, 18]$  for the four sea quark masses are included in the combined fit. The axial vector correlator is multiplied by a factor 50 for better visibility.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown that the corrections due to the explicit chiral symmetry breaking of Wilson fermions are highly suppressed. For typical quark masses these corrections enter at either NNLO (GSM regime) or at NLO (GSM\* regime). The reason for this suppression can be traced back to the fact that the lattice spacing corrections in the chiral effective action and the effective operators are either quadratic in  $a$  or they come with an additional power of either  $m$  or  $p^2$ . There is no explicit term with a single power of  $a$  only, since such a term solely contributes to the additive mass renormalization which is absorbed in the quark mass. Hence, the lattice spacing corrections are suppressed in the chiral expansion, similar to the

terms in the Gasser-Leutwyler Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_4$ .

In the Aoki regime the modifications are more substantial, affecting the correlators already at LO. The main complication in this regime are the zero mode integrals, which are no longer the known Bessel functions.

We tested our formulae against recent lattice data. We found that the additional terms which come from the broken chiral symmetry have very little impact on the extracted values of  $F$  and  $\Sigma$  whereas the low-energy constant associated with the breaking is hard to determine precisely.

Our results derived here can be generalized in various ways, for example to the case with a twisted mass term or to an arbitrary number of flavors. The details of the calculation will change, but our various power countings can be carried over with almost no modification. Perhaps most interesting from a practical point of view is an extension along the lines of Ref. [55], where one considers a mixed setup with some quarks in the  $\epsilon$ -regime and some others in the  $p$ -regime.

However, the main conclusion one can draw is that the effects due to explicit chiral symmetry breaking of Wilson fermions in the  $\epsilon$ -regime are less severe than anticipated before. In view of the results of Ref. [22] and the ones presented here, simulations with Wilson fermions seem to be a viable alternative to the daunting task of dynamical simulations with chiral fermions.

#### **Note added**

After this paper was completed we received a paper by A. Shindler which also deals with Wilson fermions in the  $\epsilon$ -regime and comes to similar conclusions [56].

#### **Acknowledgments**

We would like to thank A. Hasenfratz and P. Hernandez for fruitful discussions and A. Hasenfratz for reading the manuscript.

S.N. is supported by Marie Curie Fellowship MEIF-CT-2006-025673, and thanks the Physics Institute of the Humboldt University (Berlin) for hospitality during the preparation of this work.

This work is partially supported by EC Sixth Framework Program under the contract MRTN-CT-2006-035482 (FLAVIANet), by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (SFB/TR 09) and the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación under Grant No. FPA2007-60323 and by CPAN (Grant No. CSD2007-00042).

#### **APPENDIX A: SOME RESULTS FOR THE EPSILON REGIME**

In this Appendix we summarize formulae which are relevant for the computation of correlation functions in the  $\epsilon$ -regime of chiral perturbation theory.



Starting from the leading order continuum chiral Lagrangian of Eq. (1) and by introducing the parametrization of Eq. (25), we can read off the finite-volume scalar propagator for the nonzero modes:

$$\bar{G}(x) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{p \neq 0} \frac{e^{ipx}}{p^2}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

with

$$p = 2\pi \left( \frac{n_0}{T}, \frac{\vec{n}}{L} \right).$$

The propagator  $\bar{G}(x)$  satisfies the following properties:

$$\int_V d^4x \bar{G}(x) = 0, \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\partial_\mu \bar{G}(0) = 0, \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\square \bar{G}(x) = -\delta(x) + \frac{1}{V}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

UV divergencies, if present, are treated in dimensional regularization.

We define [45, 57]

$$\bar{G}(0) \equiv -\frac{\beta_1}{\sqrt{V}}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$T \frac{d}{dT} \bar{G}(0) \equiv \frac{T^2 k_{00}}{V}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

where  $\beta_1$  and  $k_{00}$  are finite dimensionless *shape coefficients* which depend on the geometry of the box. They can be evaluated numerically: for instance, for a symmetric box with  $L = T$  one has  $\beta_1 = 0.140461$  and  $k_{00} = \beta_1/2$  (see also [46]).

In order to obtain time correlators one has to perform integrals over the spatial components of given functions of the propagators  $\bar{G}(x)$ . In particular we define [45, 57]<sup>11</sup>

$$K_{\mu\nu}(x-y) = \bar{G}(x-y) \partial_{x_\mu} \partial_{y_\nu} \bar{G}(x-y) - \partial_{x_\mu} \bar{G}(x-y) \partial_{y_\nu} \bar{G}(x-y) + \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$+ \partial_{x_\mu} \partial_{y_\nu} H(x-y),$$

$$H(x-y) = -\frac{1}{V} \int_V d^4z \bar{G}(x-z) \bar{G}(z-y). \quad (\text{A8})$$

The integrals that we need for this work are ( $x_0 = t$ ):

$$\int d^3\vec{x} \bar{G}(x-y)|_{y=0} = T h_1 \left( \frac{t}{T} \right) = \frac{T}{2} \left[ \left( \left| \frac{t}{T} \right| - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{12} \right], \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$\int d^3\vec{x} K_{00}(x-y)|_{y=0} = \frac{T}{V} k_{00}, \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$\partial_{x_0} \partial_{y_0} \int d^3\vec{x} H(x-y)|_{y=0} = -\frac{T}{V} h_1 \left( \frac{t}{T} \right). \quad (\text{A11})$$

<sup>11</sup> In the original definition of [45, 57],  $K_{\mu\nu}(x-y)$  contains also contact terms, which we do not consider in our computation since we are interested in the correlators for  $x \neq y$ .

Finally, we recall the  $SU(N_f)$  completeness relations which are used for the computation of correlation functions. Given the  $SU(N_f)$  generators  $T^a$ , with  $a = 1, \dots, N_f^2 - 1$  and the convention

$$\text{Tr}[T^a T^b] = \frac{1}{2} \delta^{ab},$$

one obtains

$$\text{Tr}(T^a A T^a B) = -\frac{1}{2N_f} \text{Tr}(AB) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(A) \text{Tr}(B), \quad (\text{A12})$$

$$\text{Tr}(T^a A) \text{Tr}(T^a B) = -\frac{1}{2N_f} \text{Tr}(A) \text{Tr}(B) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(AB). \quad (\text{A13})$$

## APPENDIX B: SU(2) INTEGRALS

In the case  $N_f = 2$ , the partition function related to the zero-mode integrals in Eq. (54) is given by

$$Z_0 = \int_{SU(2)} [dU_0] e^{\frac{\mu}{2} \text{Tr}(U_0 + U_0^\dagger)} = \frac{I_1(2\mu)}{\mu}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where  $I_n$  is the modified Bessel function of the first kind. The normalization

$$\int_{SU(2)} [dU_0] = 1 \quad (\text{B2})$$

has been adopted. Expectation values of arbitrary integer powers of  $\text{Tr}(U_0)$  can be obtained by computing derivatives of  $Z_0$ . In particular, for this work we need

$$\langle \text{Tr} U_0 \rangle = \frac{1}{Z_0} \frac{\partial Z_0}{\partial \mu} = 2 \frac{I_2(2\mu)}{I_1(2\mu)}, \quad (\text{B3})$$

$$\langle (\text{Tr} U_0)^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{Z_0} \frac{\partial^2 Z_0}{\partial \mu^2} = 4 - \frac{6}{\mu} \frac{I_2(2\mu)}{I_1(2\mu)}, \quad (\text{B4})$$

$$\langle (\text{Tr} U_0)^3 \rangle = \frac{1}{Z_0} \frac{\partial^3 Z_0}{\partial \mu^3} = -\frac{12}{\mu} + \frac{8(3 + \mu^2) I_2(2\mu)}{\mu^2 I_1(2\mu)}, \quad (\text{B5})$$

$$\langle (\text{Tr} U_0)^4 \rangle = \frac{1}{Z_0} \frac{\partial^4 Z_0}{\partial \mu^4} = 16 + \frac{60}{\mu^2} - \frac{24(5 + 2\mu^2) I_2(2\mu)}{\mu^3 I_1(2\mu)}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

Other integrals needed in this work can be related to the previous ones, for instance:

$$\langle \text{Tr} U_0^2 \rangle = 2 - \frac{3}{\mu} \langle \text{Tr} U_0 \rangle = 2 - \frac{6}{\mu} \frac{I_2(2\mu)}{I_1(2\mu)}, \quad (\text{B7})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{Tr} U_0^2 (\text{Tr} U_0)^2 \rangle &= -\frac{6}{\mu^3} \langle \text{Tr} U_0 \rangle + 2 \left( 1 + \frac{3}{\mu^2} \right) \langle (\text{Tr} U_0)^2 \rangle - \frac{3}{\mu} \langle (\text{Tr} U_0)^3 \rangle \\ &= \frac{4(15 + 2\mu^2)}{\mu^2} - \frac{12(10 + 3\mu^2) I_2(2\mu)}{\mu^3 I_1(2\mu)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B8})$$

## APPENDIX C: OTHER CORRELATORS

Here we summarize the GSM\* results for some other correlators. We start with the correlation function of the time component of two vector currents,

$$\langle V_0^a(x) V_0^b(y) \rangle = \delta^{ab} C_{VV}(x-y), \quad (C1)$$

which we again split into a continuum part and a correction proportional to the lattice spacing,

$$C_{VV}(x-y) = C_{VV,\text{ct}}(x-y) + C_{VV,a^2}(x-y). \quad (C2)$$

In our notation the leading order vector current in the chiral effective theory reads

$$V_{\mu,\text{ct}}^a = -i \frac{F^2}{2} \text{Tr} (T^a (U^\dagger \partial_\mu U + U \partial_\mu U^\dagger)). \quad (C3)$$

The continuum contribution at  $O(\epsilon^6)$  for generic  $N_f$  has been calculated before by Hansen [45] (see also [49]). After integrating over the spatial coordinates one gets

$$C_{VV}^{ab}(t) = \delta^{ab} \left[ -\frac{1}{T} \alpha_V + \frac{T}{V} k_{00} \beta_V \right], \quad (C4)$$

with

$$\alpha_V = \frac{F^2}{2} (2 - \langle \mathcal{J}_0 \rangle_{\text{eff}}) + \frac{N_f}{2} \frac{\beta_1}{\sqrt{V}} (2 - \langle \mathcal{J}_0 \rangle), \quad (C5)$$

$$\beta_V = \frac{N_f}{2} \langle \mathcal{J}_0 \rangle. \quad (C6)$$

The function  $\mathcal{J}_0$  has been defined in Eq. 76. In particular, for  $N_f = 2$  the result explicitly reads

$$C_{VV}^{ab}(t) = -\frac{F^2}{T} \left( \frac{I_2(2\mu_{\text{eff}})}{\mu_{\text{eff}} I_1(2\mu_{\text{eff}})} \right) - \frac{2\beta_1}{T\sqrt{V}} \left( \frac{I_2(2\mu)}{\mu I_1(2\mu)} \right) + \frac{2T}{V} k_{00} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\mu} \frac{I_2(2\mu)}{I_1(2\mu)} \right). \quad (C7)$$

The  $O(a^2)$  correction in terms of the PCAC mass is given by

$$C_{VV,a^2}(t) = -\frac{F^2}{T} \rho \Delta_{a^2}, \quad (C8)$$

where  $\Delta_{a^2}$  is defined in Eq. (95). Comparing this with the result for the AA correlator in (93) we observe that the lattice spacing corrections in these two correlators are, up to a sign, identical.

With both the AA and the VV correlator at hand we can trivially obtain the correlation functions of right- and left-handed currents. For example, with  $L_\mu^a = [V_\mu^a - A_\mu^a]/2$  we find

$$C_{LL}(t) = \frac{1}{4} (C_{VV}(t) + C_{AA}(t)), \quad (C9)$$

and the  $O(a^2)$  corrections cancel in the sum on the right hand side, i.e.

$$C_{LL,a^2}(t) = 0 \quad (\text{C10})$$

while the continuum part is given by [45, 46]

$$\begin{aligned} C_{LL,ct}(t) &= \frac{1}{4} \left[ -\frac{F^2}{T} - \frac{N_f}{T} \frac{\beta_1}{\sqrt{V}} + N_f \frac{T}{V} k_{00} - \frac{T}{V} \langle \text{Tr}(U_0 + U_0^\dagger) \rangle \frac{\tilde{\mu}}{N_f} h_1 \left( \frac{t}{T} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ -\frac{F^2}{2T} - \frac{1}{T} \frac{\beta_1}{\sqrt{V}} + \frac{T}{V} k_{00} - \frac{T}{V} \frac{\tilde{\mu} I_2(2\tilde{\mu})}{I_1(2\tilde{\mu})} h_1 \left( \frac{t}{T} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C11})$$

The same result can be obtained by a direct calculation of the correlator, of course.

Finally, the scalar correlator

$$\langle S^a(x) S^b(y) \rangle = \delta^{ab} C_{SS}(x - y) \quad (\text{C12})$$

vanishes identically in the chiral effective theory for  $N_f = 2$ , as one can check either by explicit calculation or by using  $G$ -parity.

- 
- [1] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Phys. Lett. **B184** (1987) 83.
  - [2] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Phys. Lett. **B188** (1987) 477.
  - [3] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Ann. Phys. **158** (1984) 142.
  - [4] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Nucl. Phys. **B250** (1985) 465.
  - [5] S. Necco, PoS **LAT2007** (2007) 021.
  - [6] H. Leutwyler and A. V. Smilga, Phys. Rev. **D46** (1992) 5607.
  - [7] H. Neuberger, Phys. Lett. **B417** (1998) 141.
  - [8] D. B. Kaplan, Phys. Lett. **B288** (1992) 342.
  - [9] Y. Shamir, Nucl. Phys. **B406** (1993) 90.
  - [10] V. Furman and Y. Shamir, Nucl. Phys. **B439** (1995) 54.
  - [11] P. Hernandez, K. Jansen and L. Lellouch, Phys. Lett. **B469** (1999) 198.
  - [12] T. A. DeGrand, Phys. Rev. **D64** (2001) 117501.
  - [13] P. Hasenfratz *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B643** (2002) 280.
  - [14] W. Bietenholz *et al.*, JHEP **02** (2004) 023.
  - [15] L. Giusti *et al.*, JHEP **04** (2004) 013.
  - [16] H. Fukaya, S. Hashimoto and K. Ogawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **114** (2005) 451.
  - [17] W. Bietenholz and S. Shcheredin, Nucl. Phys. **B754** (2006) 17.
  - [18] L. Giusti and S. Necco, JHEP **04** (2007) 090.
  - [19] L. Giusti *et al.*, JHEP **05** (2008) 024.
  - [20] S. Schaefer, PoS **LAT2006** (2006) 020.
  - [21] H. Fukaya *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D77** (2008) 074503.
  - [22] A. Hasenfratz, R. Hoffmann and S. Schaefer, 0806.4586 [hep-lat].
  - [23] A. Hasenfratz, R. Hoffmann and S. Schaefer, Phys. Rev. **D78** (2008) 014515.

- [24] K. Jansen *et al.*, PoS **LAT2007** (2007) 084.
- [25] K. Jansen, A. Nube and A. Shindler, 0810.0300.
- [26] C. Urbach, PoS **LATTICE2007** (2007) 022.
- [27] R. Frezzotti, P. A. Grassi, S. Sint and P. Weisz, JHEP **08** (2001) 058.
- [28] R. Frezzotti, S. Sint and P. Weisz, JHEP **07** (2001) 048.
- [29] R. Frezzotti and G. C. Rossi, JHEP **08** (2004) 007.
- [30] S. Aoki and O. Bär, Phys. Rev. **D70** (2004) 116011.
- [31] S. Aoki and O. Bär, Phys. Rev. **D74** (2006) 034511.
- [32] S. R. Sharpe and R. L. Singleton, Phys. Rev. **D58** (1998) 074501.
- [33] G. Rupak and N. Shores, Phys. Rev. **D66** (2002) 054503.
- [34] K. Symanzik, Nucl. Phys. **B226** (1983) 187.
- [35] K. Symanzik, Nucl. Phys. **B226** (1983) 205.
- [36] O. Bär, G. Rupak and N. Shores, Phys. Rev. **D70** (2004) 034508.
- [37] S. Aoki, Phys. Rev. **D68** (2003) 054508.
- [38] S. Weinberg, Physica **A96** (1979) 327.
- [39] S. R. Sharpe and J. M. S. Wu, Phys. Rev. **D71** (2005) 074501.
- [40] S. Aoki and O. Bär, PoS **LATTICE2007** (2006) 062.
- [41] S. R. Sharpe and J. M. S. Wu, Phys. Rev. **D70** (2004) 094029.
- [42] S. Aoki, O. Bär and B. Biedermann, 0806.4863.
- [43] S. Aoki, Phys. Rev. **D30** (1984) 2653.
- [44] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Nucl. Phys. **B307** (1988) 763.
- [45] F. C. Hansen, Nucl. Phys. **B345** (1990) 685.
- [46] P. Hernandez and M. Laine, JHEP **01** (2003) 063.
- [47] I. Gradshteyn and I. Ryzhik, *Table of Integrals, Series and products*, Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, Florida 32887, fourth edition, 1983.
- [48] P. H. Damgaard, M. C. Diamantini, P. Hernandez and K. Jansen, Nucl. Phys. **B629** (2002) 445.
- [49] P. H. Damgaard *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B656** (2003) 226.
- [50] C. Michael and C. Urbach, PoS **LAT2007** (2007) 122.
- [51] S. Aoki and O. Bär, Eur. Phys. J. **A31** (2007) 481.
- [52] A. Hasenfratz, R. Hoffmann and S. Schaefer, PoS **LATTICE2008** (2008).
- [53] A. Hasenfratz, R. Hoffmann and S. Schaefer, JHEP **05** (2007) 029.
- [54] R. Sommer, Nucl. Phys. **B411** (1994) 839.
- [55] F. Bernardoni, P. H. Damgaard, H. Fukaya and P. Hernandez, JHEP **10** (2008) 008.
- [56] A. Shindler, *Observations on the Wilson fermions in the  $\epsilon$  regime*.
- [57] P. Hasenfratz and H. Leutwyler, Nucl. Phys. **B343** (1990) 241.